

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

----oo0oo----

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
LEONEL RIVERA,  
  
Defendant.

No. 2:97-cr-00040 WBS

ORDER

----oo0oo----

The court previously denied defendant Leonel Rivera's Motion for Compassionate Release Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(1)(A), finding that he had not exhausted his administrative remedies by submitting a request to his warden before filing his motion in this court.<sup>1</sup> (Docket Nos. 262, 273).


<sup>1</sup> In so finding, the court noted that while defendant had submitted a request to his warden before filing a motion for compassionate release with this court in 2021, defendant had not made a new request to the Bureau of Prisons before filing his 2023 request, which was based on largely different grounds than the 2021 request. The court also noted that its dismissal was without prejudice to defendant filing a new motion for compassionate release once defendant had exhausted his

1 Defendant now moves for relief from judgment under Federal Rules  
2 of Civil Procedure and 59(e) and 60(b) because he purportedly was  
3 never served a copy of the government's response to his motion  
4 and was "never allowed to reply." (Docket No. 274.)

5 As the court previously noted, the exhaustion  
6 requirement for compassionate release motions is mandatory. See,  
7 e.g., United States v. Keller, 2 F.4th 1278, 1282 (9th Cir.  
8 2021). Defendant does not argue now that he did in fact exhaust  
9 his administrative remedies by filing a request for compassionate  
10 release with the Bureau of Prisons before filing his motion with  
11 the court, and he produces no evidence suggesting he did so. Nor  
12 does defendant identify any error in the court's prior ruling,  
13 any new evidence, any intervening change in the law, or any other  
14 ground justifying reconsideration. Thus, defendant's request for  
15 reconsideration will be denied.

16 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendant's motion for  
17 relief under Rule 60(b) and 59(e) (Docket No. 274) be, and the  
18 same hereby is, DENIED.

19 Dated: November 1, 2023

  
WILLIAM B. SHUBB  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 administrative remedies.